

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Debra Benson,)	
)	CA No. 0:10-1183-TMC-PJG
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Adrienne Coleman; Dick Rowell; Cleophus)	
White; Jerrilyn Mingo; Mary Martin; and)	
Margaret Thompson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Debra Benson (Benson) filed this action against the defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of her constitutional rights by the defendants, along with other claims. (Dkt. No. 1.) This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) (Dkt. No. 126) of the United States magistrate judge made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina. The Report recommends¹ denying defendant Margaret Thompson's motion to dismiss Benson's claims against Thompson. (Dkt. No. 104.) The court adopts the Report and denies the motion to dismiss.

On December 7, 2011, the magistrate judge issued the Report, which sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the magistrate judge's Report herein without a recitation. Objections to the Report were due by December 27, 2011. However, no objections to the Report have been filed. In the absence of objections to the Report,

¹ The magistrate judge's recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. (Dkt. No. 126.) It is therefore **ORDERED** that the motion to dismiss is **DENIED**. (Dkt. No. 104.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
December 29, 2011

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of

the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.